

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 203, 204, 217, 218 and 251-258 were pending in the Application. Claims 203, 217 and 255 were amended. Claims 251-254, 257 and 258 were cancelled. Claims 203, 204, 217, 218, 255 and 256 are now pending in the application.

The amendments of claims 203, 217 and 255 were made to better clarify the present invention. The amendments regarding the existence of “bottom section extensions disposed under respective inwardly bents” find support in Figures 23, 21, 20, 20B and 1C, and in the specification on page 28, lines 19-24, and on page 29, lines 1-5. The amendments regarding the restriction that “each one of the front snapping segment and the back snapping segment comprise an inwardly directed bent” find support in Figures 20, 21, 20, 20B and 1F, and in the specification on page 5, lines 25-26, on page 28, lines 26-28, and on page 29, lines 1-5, among other places. The amendments regarding the restriction that the device of the present invention comprises a **single** bottom section, the top section and the **single** bottom section being connected by the side section finds support in Figure 23 and in the specification, page 53, lines 15-23, among other places.

The amendment in the specification on page 1 lines 10-14 of the respective paragraph finds support in the applications referred to. The amendment in the specification on page 50 lines 13-14 of the respective paragraph finds support in Figures 23, 21, 20, 20B and 1C, and in the specification on page 28, lines 19-24, and on page 29, lines 1-5. The amendment in the specification on page 50 lines 19-27 of the respective paragraph finds support in Figures 23, 20, 21, 20, 20B and 1F, and in the specification on page 5, lines 25-26, on page 28, lines 26-28, and on page 29, lines 1-5, among other places.

The amendment of Figures 1C, 1F, 20, 21, 20B, and 23, find support in the Figures themselves, and in the specification on page 28, lines 19-24, on page 29, lines 1-5, and on page 50, lines 5-27.

An information Disclosure Statement is attached.

NEW ARGUMENTS
Regarding Final Rejection of 06/22/2004

Double Patenting

All pending claims were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 191-202 and 205-216 of co-pending Application No. 10/607,863.

Applicant respectfully submits that he shall file a proper Terminal disclaimer when the pending claims of this application become allowable otherwise, except for the issue of double patenting.

Claim Objections

Claims 252 and 253 were objected to because of incorrect preamble. Claims 252 and 253 have now been cancelled, and therefore Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The comments of the Examiner regarding the quotation of 35 USC § 102(b) are acknowledged.

Claims 203, 204, 217, 218 and 251-258 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817).

Applicant respectfully traverses the position of the Office Action. The claims of the present invention, have immense differences when compared to what Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817) discloses, not only after the amendment of the claims of the present invention, but even before the amendment.

Applicant respectfully submits, that there are major critical features and elements, which clearly distinguish the present invention from Parkin' s disclosure.

First and foremost, the claims of the present invention, even before the amendment, require that the holes in both sections (top and bottom) are “**engageable continuous holes**”. The definition of “**engageable continuous holes**” is given on page 4, lines 23-27 of the specification stating:

“Engageable continuous holes formed on a sheet metal fastener have a helical configuration of the edge of the hole, which helical configuration corresponds to the thread of the screw or bolt to be used in combination with the engageable continuous holes. In some occasions the helical configuration is suitable to fit double threads.”

In contrast, Parkin' s holes or apertures 9a and 10a have flared lips 11 and 12, which are urged into locking engagement with the adjacent threaded portion of the shank *a* to lock the latter against rotation and thereby secure it in its adjusted position, after manual pressure for alignment of the two apertures has been released (see Figure 4 and column 2, line 56 to column 3, line 8 of Parkin' s reference).

Thus, Parkin' s disclosure not only does not anticipate the use of exclusively **engageable continuous holes** according to the present invention, but **definitely leads away** from such configuration.

In addition, as claims 203, 217 and 255 have now been amended, require that each one of the front snapping segment 2 and the back snapping segment 4 comprise an **inwardly directed** bent portion 2” and 4”, respectively.

In contrast, Parkin' s reference discloses a pair of resilient arms 3 and 4 having **outwardly extending** resilient lugs 3a and 4a, and **outwardly projecting** feet 5 and 6 (see Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 27-32 of Parkin' s reference).

It should be noted at this point that the Office Action itself equalizes the snapping segments 2 and 4 of the instant invention with the pair of resilient arms 3 and 4 of Parkin' s reference.

Again, Parkin' s disclosure not only does not anticipate the use of inwardly bent portions originating from the snapping segments according to the present invention, but **definitely leads away** from such configuration.

Further, as claims 203, 217 and 255 have now been amended, require the presence of bottom section extensions 40 disposed between the left side section 18 and the right side section 16, under the front snapping segment 2 and the back snapping segment 4.

In contrast, Parkin' s configuration does not have such extensions on base 10.

It should be noted at this point that the Office Action equalizes the bottom section 14 of the instant invention with a "base 10" of Parkin' s reference.

Therefore, Parkin' s disclosure does not anticipate the presence of any bottom section extensions from the bottom section.

In addition, as claims 203, 217 and 255 have now been amended, require the presence of a **single** bottom section.

In contrast, Parkin' s configuration does not have a single bottom section, but it has, and actually requires, a **double** bottom section to accommodate the two misaligned apertures. Unless, the two bottom sections are present in Parkin' s device, said device would be completely inoperable. Both "bottom sections" 9 and 10 are necessary to accommodate the respective apertures 9a and 10a which are forced initially to be aligned with the aperture 2 for the screw threaded shank *a* to be readily inserted axially into the cage, and then allowed to be misaligned so that the flared lips 11 and 12 of said apertures 9a and 10a lock the shank in position. It is evident that a single aperture, either 9a or 10a, could not perform this function by itself.

Once again, Parkin' s disclosure not only does not anticipate the use of a **single** bottom section as is the case of the present invention, but **definitely leads away** from such configuration.

Therefore, Applicant earnestly believes that independent claims 203, 217 and 255, as well as dependent claims 204, 218 and 256, which depend directly from the respective independent claims 203, 217 and 255, are not anticipated under 35 USC § 102(b) by Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817), and respectfully requests removal of the rejection.

Response to Remarks

The arguments of the Final Office Action regarding Applicant's arguments in Applicant' Response dated 05/03/2004 to the Office Action of 04/07/2004 have been addressed hereinabove.

Conclusion

The comments of the Examiner are acknowledged.